

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

Campus Commons 2200

Wednesday, April 16th, 2025 | 3:30-5:00PM

Present: Barkley, Brown, DeKrey, Garrett, Iannacchione, Kang, Kyle, Lee, Senbet, Wieben

Zoom: Dineen, English, Landry

Absent: Lunaris

Call to Order 3:31pm

Approval of Agenda approved without objection

Approval of April 2, 2025, meeting minutes approved without objection

Chair's Report/Announcements

1. Is it OK to push 1-1-307 to the Codification Committee?
 - It would be helpful to receive some feedback before starting a new section to ensure proper guidance.
 - Sections 1-1-307 and 2-3-801 will be sent to provost Fleming and Codification
2. We need to gather nominations for Chair and Vice Chair for the 2025/2026 committee. Election can take place at the April 30 meeting.
 - Chair – Jeff Brown (nominated by DeKrey and accepted)
 - Vice – Chair – Juien Lee (nominated by DeKrey and accepted)
 - Voting will be held at next meeting

Subcommittee Reports

1. None

Special Orders

1. None

Unfinished Business

1. 2-3-801 Faculty Evaluation
 - Continue at (3)(a) – Preliminaries
 - There is something like this for CR (page 6)
 - (I)
 - It was clarified that if there are disagreements, it will be moved to deans similar to the contract renewable evaluations.
 - Process
 - (I)
 - Insert “The evaluatee will have the opportunity to respond to the reviews at all levels.” At the end of this section.
 - (IV)

- Insert “a disagreement between the unit/program-level evaluation committee and unit leader or if” after “in the case of”
 - Remove “who”
- (V)
 - End this section with “then the dean will forward the review to the CAO, who will make a final decision.”
- Insert a new (VI),
 - “For subperiod reviews that may result in a negative employment outcome for the evaluated, the CAO, consistent with the program area’s criteria, will make the final decision.”
 - Comment for Provost Fleming: does this cover what you’re hoping for in terms of reviewing actionable items, while empowering the deans/avoiding additional work in the provost’s office?
 - Faculty evaluations should not be the basis for employment outcomes, but feedback is usually from evaluations.
 - Fleming would like the process to stop at the dean and only actionable items be moved up to her. Actionable items include,
 - Anyone up for promotion
 - Anyone up for tenure
 - Disagreements or non-recommendations
- There was clarification of the connection between the subperiod evaluations and contract renewable evaluations. The first paragraph on page 14 shows that connection
- MOTION: Brown motions to approve the revision of Board Policy Manual 2-3-801 Faculty Review, seconded by Brian
- VOTE: Motion passes unanimously
 - DeKrey will make a clean copy and move it along.
- 2. 3-3-801 Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures
- 3. 2-3-305 Academic Titles
 - A section for distinguished professors will need to be added.
 - The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) discussed the title will begin a stipend for 5 years then gradually increase.
 - Proposed stipend of about \$10,000
 - A starting base of \$10,000 may not be feasible.
 - The concern of productivity was addressed.
 - It was stated that some faculty are willing to reduce their salary for more colleagues and reduce workloads.
 - There were moral concerns about doing more work without additional compensation.
 - Some institutions limit the term of a distinguished professor.
 - Barkley suggests looking into the criteria at other institutions
 - The question of, does everyone who applies receive the title was asked.
 - They would be expected to follow similar procedures as full professors, where an evaluation committee of some sort will need to be established.
 - It was suggested they should have some years in rank (YIR), using the unit’s criteria

- However, there are several professors with high YIR.
 - Senbet suggests keeping it at a unit-level and rising expectations over time.
 - Evaluations can be a base, but the standard should be exceptionally high.
 - A university-wide evaluation committee was suggested,
 - This might lead to deans and unit heads controlling decisions.
 - Senbet disagrees and thinks unit committees will have the best judgment since they will know the professor the best.
 - Questions that need to be considered are:
 - Should this title exist and why?
 - What should compensation be?
 - What does “distinguished” need to represent?
 - Term limit?
 - Pay?
 - How will UNC use this?
 - What it means should be absolutely outstanding?
 - If everyone becomes “distinguished,” the title loses value. There must be established meaningful, selective standards.
 - Criteria should go beyond standard evaluations:
 - Publications
 - Awards
 - Contributions to advancing their field
 - Lee stated that based on experience, the title should reflect all contributions that make someone truly outstanding.
4. 3-3-902 Faculty salary bonus for award of Distinguished Professor title

New Business

1. Distinguished Professor designation
2. Regulatory compliance issues.
3. Faculty workload policy – revision by Jeri Lyons
4. Consideration of service and professional activity weighting within faculty evaluation
5. Ethical use of student evaluations of teaching within faculty evaluation, DEI consideration
6. Advocate for faculty free access to recreation center
7. Codify Research Fellow designation as (e.g., part of Emeritus)?

Completed Business

1. Revision of 1-1-307 on 10/9/2024 – on hold for submission to Codification Committee until completion of 2-3-801 and 3-3-801.
2. Revision of 2-3-304 Affiliate Faculty on 11/6/2024 – approved by BOT on 12/13/2024.
3. Revision of 2-3-305 Academic Titles on 11/6/2024 – approved by BOT on 12/13/2024.

Transferred Business

1. Step-back policy – transferred to Salary Equity Committee
2. Amorous Relationship policy – now being considered by APC

Call to the Good of the Order

Good meeting!

Adjournment 4:54pm